

New Data on Aramaic in Classical *Piyyut* – תשמיע ניהומים ללישה, a *Silluq* for Shabbat *Shim'u* by Yoḥanan ha-Kohen

Michael Rand

University of Cambridge

Abstract: The present article briefly reviews the research that has been conducted to-date on the use of Aramaic in Classical *piyyut*, and provides new material in this field: the *silluq* תשמיע ללישה from a *qedushta* for Shabbat *Shim'u* by Yoḥanan ha-Kohen, which includes an Aramaic passage. One of the manuscript sources for this composition, ms. ENA 3443/2, is also analyzed, and its copyist is identified as Eli ben Yehoshua he-Ḥaver (11th century).

Keywords: Aramaic, *piyyut*, Yoḥanan ha-Kohen, Shabbat *Shim'u*, Eli ben Yehoshua he-Ḥaver

1. Introduction

Over the course of approximately the past decade the subject of Aramaic in *piyyut* has received a certain amount of scholarly attention. By way of introduction to the text that is edited below, I would like to provide some essential background, and then to speculate with regard to a number of potential interim results.

First, let us consider *piyyut*,¹ which is a kind of poetic literature whose existence is intimately tied to the rabbinic Jewish liturgy that emerged in Roman and Late Antiquity and continues in use to this day in various geographically-defined rites.² For the present purposes, the fundamental tectonic principle of Jewish liturgy may be described as the stringing together of various liturgical benedictions (*berakhot*, sing. *berakha*), such that a specific sequence of benedictions represents a given prayer. I will focus here on the Prayer *par excellence*, known as the *amida* (pl. *amidot*) which essentially defines a statutory liturgical occasion—i.e., the Jewish liturgical day may be meaningfully described in terms of the *amidot* that are recited over its course.³

The benediction, which is the fundamental building block of the *amida*, has an internal articulation of its own. In a string of benedictions, the first opens with a formula whose most standard form is: ...אלהינו מלך העולם אשר... 'Blessed are you O Lord, our God, King of the Universe, who...' This formulaic opening is followed by the body of the benediction, which is introduced in the form of a relative clause dependent on אשר. The body is composed in prose

* I would like to record my gratitude to my teacher Shulamit Elizur and to Ya'akov Setel, both of whom kindly read and commented on an early version of this article, especially the commentary to the *piyyut* edited below.

¹ For a comprehensive treatment of *piyyut* and the history of its development see E. Fleischer, שירת-הקודש העברית, בימי-הביניים (Jerusalem: Magnes, 2nd ed., 2007). A useful English-language introduction may be found in M. Rand, 'Fundamentals of the Study of Piyyut', in C. Leonhard and H. Löhr (eds.), *Literature or Liturgy? – Early Christian Hymns and Prayers in their Literary and Liturgical Context in Antiquity* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014) pp. 107-125.

² For the early history of Jewish prayer, see J. Heinemann, *Prayer in the Talmud* (Berlin/New York, Walter de Gruyter: 1977). The most accessible and comprehensive English-language handbook on the subject is I. Elbogen, *Jewish Liturgy: A Comprehensive History* (trans. R.P. Scheindlin; Philadelphia/New York/Jerusalem: JPS/JTSA, 1993).

³ The other core Jewish prayer, which I will not discuss here, is the *Shema*, which is centered on the recitation of the verse 'Hear, O Israel...' (Deut. 6:4). See Elbogen, *Liturgy*, pp. 16-24.

that provides its specific content, i.e., various forms of praise and supplication addressed to God. The prose body is followed in turn by an abbreviated concluding formula, which summarizes its theme: ... ברוך אתה 'Blessed are You, O Lord...' ⁴ Thereupon follow all subsequent benedictions in the chain, with the exception that, unlike the first benediction, they dispense with the opening formula, beginning directly with the body. According to the ancient rite of Palestine, in the context of which *piyyut* arose and developed in its initial phases, the weekday *amida* contains 18 benedictions. However, in all of the rites currently in use, which are ultimately rooted in the rite of Babylon, the number has gone up to 19. In all rites, the *amida* for Sabbaths and Festivals contains only seven benedictions.

The Jewish liturgical calendar is founded on the simultaneous operation of two cycles: the cycle of the Sabbaths, at the basis of which lies the sequential weekly reading of Pentateuchal lections, each of which is associated with a fixed Prophetic lection (*haftara*); and the cycle of Festivals and special Sabbaths. The periodicity of the first cycle depends on the number of lections into which the Pentateuch is divided. Thus, in the Palestinian rite, the entire Pentateuch was read over the course of approximately three and a half years, while the Babylonian rite the reading was completed in one year. The festival cycle is annual and begins with Passover.

Returning now to the structure of the *amida*, it is evident that the string of benediction formulas constitutes the skeletal structure of the prayer, with specific content being supplied by the body of each benediction. Strictly speaking, from the point of view of Jewish law, only the sequence of fixed benediction formulas is obligatory, while the specific content of each benediction may be freely composed. This is where *piyyut* comes in. In essence, *piyyut* composition functions by replacing the prose, statutory body of the benediction by a poetic formulation. However, since only the body of the benediction is replaced whereas the sting of benediction formulas remains in place, the poetic *amida*—i.e., one in which the bodies of the sequenced benedictions have been systematically replaced with units of poetry—is a string of poetic units that is rigidly organized by means of the skeletal structure of the benediction formulas to which they are attached, in principle on a one-to-one basis. *Piyyut* is therefore, in the strict sense, poetic prayer, and it is firmly anchored, structurally as well as notionally, in public, statutory Jewish liturgy. The fundamental compositional principle of *piyyut* may in turn be expressed as the one-to-one relationship between units of poetry and liturgical fixed-points. ⁵

In practice, the emergence of *piyyut* as an integral part of public Jewish prayer was facilitated by the fact that in the majority of cases the *amida* is recited silently by each member of the congregation and then publically repeated out-loud by the precentor (*hazzan*). The precentor's repetition may take the form of the text that has been recited silently by each individual, with additions as ritually appropriate to a public—rather than a private—prayer. However, instead of duplicating the statutory text, the precentor's repetition may retain only its skeletal structure of benediction formulas, around which is organized an alternative, poetic composition. The genre-term for a *piyyut* composition that accompanies the precentor's recitation of the *amida* is *qerova*.

⁴ Cf., for example, the concluding formula of the first benediction of the *amida*, which praises God as the God of the Patriarchs and the Redeemer of Israel: ברוך אתה יי מן אברהם 'Blessed are You, O Lord, Shield of Abraham'. For an in-depth study of the development of the liturgical benediction see Heinemann, *Prayer*, pp. 77-103.

⁵ The most common type of liturgical fixed-point is the benediction formula, which is mentioned above. However, other elements in the text of the statutory liturgy may serve the same function.

The *qerova* genre is further divided into sub-types in accordance with the different possible sorts of *amida*-configurations, each one being a function of the specific liturgical occasion—e.g., an *amida* of 18 benedictions on weekdays versus an *amida* of seven benedictions on Sabbaths and festivals.

The structural principles that are adumbrated here are mostly relevant to the Classical period of *piyyut* literature.⁶ It is impossible to be precise in delimiting this period, but one may say with confidence that Classical *piyyut* is to be placed in Palestine in Late Antique and early Muslim times. The Classical period is characterized especially by the use of rhyme and the concomitant predominance of strophic patterning, as well as the use of acrostic signatures in which the poets (*payyetanim*, sing. *payyetan*) indicate their names, and occasionally other bits of biographical information. The most prominent genre of the Classical period is the *qedushta*, which is a sub-type of *qerova* (see also below).

In addition to statutory prayer, the synagogue liturgy of Sabbaths and Festivals includes a second basic component—the Scriptural lection. As mentioned above, the cycle of Pentateuchal and Prophetic lections is one of the two fundamental parameters of the Jewish liturgical cycle.⁷ During the period in question, two additional aspects of the synagogue liturgy were organized around the reading of Scripture: the Targum, i.e., the translation of the biblical text into Aramaic, which served as the vernacular of Palestinian Jews before its replacement by Arabic; and the sermon. Both of these served one way or another as expositions of the Scriptural reading. Finally, Jewish liturgy in the broad sense includes prayers recited outside of the synagogue, such as the Grace after Meals (*Birkat ha-Mazon*) or various funerary texts.

Given the above sketch, it is not difficult to see how *piyyut*, which we may define for the moment as Hebrew liturgical poetry (but see below), fits into the liturgical scheme of the synagogue—it is attached directly to the skeletal structure of the fundamental prayers, and serves as a replacement for their statutory (prose) contents. However, together with Hebrew, Jewish poetic production during the period in question proceeded along a parallel, Aramaic track. This fact is entirely consonant with the general trajectory of Jewish literary activity in Hellenistic/Roman Palestine, which indicates essentially that Jews have been composing poetry in Aramaic for as long as they have been composing literature in that language. Thus, poetry is attested already in the Biblical Aramaic corpus, as well as among the Aramaic documents of the Dead Sea Scrolls.⁸ In the Late Antique period, Jewish Aramaic poetry, which in terms of

⁶ The periodization of *piyyut* literature is treated extensively in Fleischer, שירת-הקודש.

⁷ In the Classical Period, at least two full cycles of *qedushtot* were composed to accompany the weekly Scriptural readings of the Palestinian triennial lectionary cycle, by the *payyetanim* Yannai and Shim'on bar Megas.

⁸ Relatively short stretches of poetic text appear in the Book of Daniel (as recognized by the editors of *BHS*)—see for example Dan. 2:21-22; 3:33; 7:9-20, and so forth. Aramaic poems are also attested in the Dead Sea Scrolls. See for example the Ode to Sarai in the Genesis Apocryphon (1QapGen col. 20:1-8) published in J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1 (1Q20)* (Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 3rd ed., 2004) p. 100; and the poem contained in the Aramaic Testament of Levi (4QLevi^a ar frg. 1 col. i 5-21, col. ii 1) published in J.C. Greenfield, M.E. Stone and E. Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document* (Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha, 19, Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2004) pp. 102-109; M.E. Stone and J.C. Greenfield, 'Aramaic Levi Document', in G. Brooke et al. (eds.), *Qumran Cave 4 XVII – Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (DJD XXII, Oxford: Clarendon, 1996) pp. 9-15. Jewish liturgical poetry in general, both Hebrew as well as Aramaic, is part of a wider literary phenomenon observable in the Roman and Late Antique Near East, which is manifested also in the Samaritan and Syriac (along with the Greek-Byzantine) liturgical-poetic traditions. For the three Aramaic traditions, see A.S. Rodrigues Pereira,

quantity as well as quality is undeniably the poor cousin of Hebrew, is divisible into three categories, each of which is associated with a certain liturgical locus. Each locus, in turn, may be defined in terms of the broad structure of Jewish liturgy as outlined above.⁹ The first category is Targum poetry, which is a diffuse corpus of poetic material that is associated in various ways with the Aramaic translation of the Scriptural lections.¹⁰ The second category consists of poems that are intended for incorporation into the actual prayer component of the liturgy. In principle, Aramaic *piyyutim* belonging to this category are directly equivalent to their Hebrew counterparts. In reality, however, no such parity exists, since—as far as can be ascertained on the basis of our present knowledge—this category is restricted to one, relatively minor genre: *qinot* for the Ninth of Av, i.e., dirges mourning the destruction of the Temple.¹¹ The third category of Aramaic poems consists of those that are intended for para-liturgical occasions: wedding poems and

Studies in Aramaic Poetry (c. 100 B.C.E. – c. 600 B.C.E.) (Studia Semitica Neerlandica, 34, Assen: Van Gorcum, 1997), which contains ample and fully-analyzed text samples together with a generous bibliography. For the Ode to Sarai, see pp. 11-26. For a theoretical overview of this subject, see O. Münz-Manor, 'Liturgical Poetry in the Late Antique Near East – A Comparative Approach', *Journal of Ancient Judaism* 1 (2010), pp. 336-361.

⁹ A similar observation is made by Sh. Elizur, 'לדרכי שילובם של יסודות ארמיים בפיוטי ארץ ישראל הקדומים', *Leshonenu* 70 (2008), pp. 331-348 (332-333, note 4).

¹⁰ The largest edited collection of Targum poems is J. Yahalom and M. Sokoloff, *שירת בני מערבא* (Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1999). See also the important review by M. Kister, 'שירת בני מערבא – היבטים בעולמה של שירה עלומה', *Tarbiz* 76 (2006), pp. 105-184. A number of Targumic poems are studied in Rodrigues Pereira, *Aramaic Poetry*, pp. 58-109. For additional, relatively late Eastern examples, see the Targum poems by Shemuel Ha-Shelishi (10th-11th centuries), edited in J. Yahalom and N. Katsumata, *יוצרות רבי שמואל השלישי* (Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zevi, 2014) pp. 939-956 (note especially the editors' remarks on p. 939); and two poems by Sahlan ben Avraham (11th century): *אלהא אדירא שמיא*, edited in E. Fleischer, "'ראש ראשי חדשים'", in idem, *תפילות הקבע בישראל בהתהוותן ובהתגבשותן* (Sh. Elizur and T. Beeri eds.; Jerusalem, Magnes, 2012) pp. 871-888 (875); and *איתחברו ראשי שתא*, edited in M. Rand, 'An Aramaic Dispute between the Months by Sahlan Ben Avraham', *Melilah: Manchester Journal of Jewish Studies* 9 (2012), pp. 101-113. My article contains an oversight that I would like to take the present opportunity to correct. On pp. 105-107 I reconstructed two quires of a liturgical document known as 'The First Order of Fustat' on the basis of five manuscripts: Quire 1: T-S H 12.11, T-S NS 125.96; Quire 2: T-S 13 H 3.11 + T-S NS 325.69, Mosseri VIII 394. According to the reconstruction offered there, the first quire is represented by three adjacent bi-folia, with material missing between the first three and the last three leaves (T-S H 12.11), the last of whose leaves is followed directly by a single leaf, which is known to be the last leaf in the quire (T-S NS 125.96). Given these data, I pointed out that the first leaf of the quire in question, i.e., first leaf of the original bi-folium whose second leaf is T-S NS 125.96, is missing. I furthermore surmised, on the assumption of an original quire consisting of five bi-folia, that this quire is missing an inner bi-folium. It escaped my notice, however, that two more leaves of the 'The First Order of Fustat' have been referred to in the literature: ENA 2501/5-6—see E. Fleischer, 'שרידים נוספים מקובצי תפילה ארץ-ישראלים מן הגניזה', in idem, *תפילות הקבע*, pp. 703-739 (711, note 42; for additional references to this manuscript see the index in the collected articles.) These two leaves evidently belong to the same bi-folium. The first (ENA 2501/5) contains material for Hanukkah and is a direct continuation of the first group of three leaves in T-S H 12.11. The second contains material for Shabbat *Zakhor* and Purim and directly precedes the second group of three leaves in T-S H 12.11. These two leaves themselves are not continuous—i.e., my original assumption of a quire of five bi-folia is incorrect, and the original quire seems to have been composed of six bi-folia.

¹¹ See M. Rand, 'Observations on the Relationship between JPA Poetry and the Hebrew Piyyut Tradition – The Case of the *Kinot*', in A. Gerhards and C. Leonhard (eds.), *Jewish and Christian Liturgy and Worship: New Insights into its History and Interaction* (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2007) pp. 127-144. It is important to note in this context that the *qina* genre is quintessentially Palestinian. The *qinot* do not partake of the structural principle outlined above, whereby a *piyyut* composition is built up out of units of poetry all of which are anchored in strict sequence to liturgical fixed-points such as the concluding benediction formulas. In this sense, a *qina* is an independent *piyyut*, not a *piyyut* composition. On the other hand, just as *piyyutim* are strung together within a single *piyyut* composition, so *qinot* are also strung together, the string being inserted at the appropriate point in the liturgy of the Ninth of Av.

funeral dirges.¹² Poems in this category partially overlap in terms of function with their Hebrew counterparts (see below, end of Section 2).

Together with these three basic types of Jewish Aramaic liturgical poetry, there exists Aramaic material incorporated into *piyyut* proper. This is the material that is of interest at present, and to it I now turn. The *piyyut* literature is composed in a specialized Hebrew idiom whose hallmarks are well known and have been investigated in a number of studies.¹³ This idiom comprises certain distinctive features—morphological, syntactic, lexical and semantic—which remain reasonably stable throughout the history of *piyyut* composition in the East as well as in Europe. As indicated, the *piyyut* idiom is a form of Hebrew. For analytical purposes, it can be resolved into three components: Biblical Hebrew—i.e., linguistic material drawn from the Hebrew Bible; Rabbinic Hebrew—i.e., linguistic material drawn from Tannaitic and Amoraic writings; and *piyyut* Hebrew—i.e., the remainder, that which cannot be traced back to either of the two preceding categories and is therefore taken to constitute *piyyut*-language *par excellence*. On occasion, the idiom in which *piyyut* is composed incorporates Aramaic elements. However, until recently, this phenomenon has not been accorded much attention. The first study to treat the subject in a sustained manner is an article published in 2009 by Shulamit Elizur: 'לדרכי שילובם של יסודות ארמיים בפיוטי ארץ ישראל הקדומים' (The Incorporation of Aramaic Elements in Ancient Palestinian *Piyyutim*; see above, note 9). As is apparent from the title, Elizur's analysis operates on the notion of a foreign, Aramaic element being incorporated into a Hebrew matrix. Such a notion is, in fact, reasonable, given what has been said above regarding the *piyyut* idiom. In accordance with it, Aramaic elements drawn either from the Aramaic portions of Scripture (Biblical Aramaic [BA]) or from the Aramaic vernacular of Byzantine-era Palestine, i.e., the language of Palestinian Targum and midrash (JPA), are incorporated into a *piyyut* text, either directly in their original form or in various Hebraized forms—calques, Hebrew conjugations of Aramaic roots, etc. In the wake of Elizur, I published my own contribution to the subject: "'אגג אמר הצדה" – קדושתא לפרשת זכור בלשון מעורבת עברית-ארמית' for Parashat *Zakhor* in a Mixed Hebrew-Aramaic Idiom].¹⁴ This article contains a critical edition of a *piyyut* composition that is composed in an idiom in which Hebrew and Aramaic are at times so tightly intertwined that it is no longer accurate to speak of the incorporation of Aramaic into a Hebrew matrix, but one must rather see the text as integrating the two into a new, mixed linguistic entity. On the basis of this observation, I suggested there that the concept/definition of the *piyyut* idiom be expanded somewhat to encompass two components, a Hebrew and an Aramaic, the former predominating massively from the quantitative point of view. In my article, I also reviewed the evidence for the use of Aramaic in previously published Classical *piyyut* material, noting that it is attested in the corpora of the two most famous Classical *payyetanim*, Yannai (ca. 6th century) and Eleazar be-rabbi Qillir (ca. 7th century), along with a *payyetan* whose acrostic signature is לעזר החזן.¹⁵ The material that I investigated differs from the material

¹² A number of such poems are published in Yahalom and Sokoloff, שירת בני מערבא, pp. 258-329.

¹³ The most convenient English-language introduction to the language of *piyyut* is M. Rand, 'Paytanic Hebrew', *Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics* (Leiden/Boston, Brill, 2013) pp. 3.55-60.

¹⁴ M. Rand, "'אגג אמר הצדה" – קדושתא לפרשת זכור בלשון מעורבת עברית-ארמית', in M. Bar Asher and I. Meir (eds.), נקצי אילן – מחקרים בלשון העברית ובאחיותיה מוגשים לאילן אלדר (Jerusalem: Carmel, 2014) pp. 321-53.

¹⁵ See M. Rand, קדושתא לפרשת זכור, pp. 335-338. In Yannai's *qedushta* [...] ונורא מוראך [...] אינם for the Seder יושלח יעקב איום, תקיפה ועתיק יומיה ואדום אשר [...] אימתני, as well as the *silluq* מלאכים (Gen. 32:4), the second and third *rahitim*, מחזור פיוטי רבי ינאי לתורה ולמועדים, and ומן בית יעקב אש – כרך א (Jerusalem: Bialik, 1985) pp. 199-200. Qillir includes an Aramaic section in his *silluq* כי מי ידע דינך for Yom

treated by Elizur in that it consists of cases of sustained presence of Aramaic, either over the course of a large portion (perhaps even the majority) of an entire composition, as in the case of the *qedushta* for Parashat *Zakhor* that I published, or within a limited stretch of text that is incorporated into the Hebrew framework of the *piyyut* composition in which it appears, as in the other cases that I studied. Elizur, on the other hand, examined cases of local incorporation of individual Aramaic elements (words, phrases, sentences) into the Hebrew context. In view of this distinction in the data, the slight difference in our conclusions is not surprising.

2. Aramaic Texts in *Piyyutim*

On the basis of an analysis of the corpus that I assembled, I was able to make two generalizations about the use/status of Aramaic in the *piyyut* idiom. First, the integration of Aramaic and Hebrew within a *piyyut* idiom that can truly be considered mixed is (so far) unique to the *qedushta* אגג הצדה. In the other cases, the linguistic borders between Hebrew and Aramaic areas of a given *piyyut* text are easily discerned. Second, in the majority of cases, the Aramaic that is employed in *piyyut* is of the BA type, the use of JPA being less common. Different degrees of mixture of the two dialects within a given Aramaic *piyyut* text are, moreover, attested: predominantly BA, mixed BA/JPA, and predominantly JPA.

I have now identified an additional instance of the use of Aramaic in Classical *piyyut*. In view of the relative rarity of Aramaic within the Classical *piyyut* corpus, this example is worthy of attention, and an edition of the *piyyut* in which it is found is provided below. The Aramaic text in question, lines 26-35 in the edition, confirms the findings summarized above. It is embedded within a Hebrew *piyyut*, and its beginning and end are clearly delimited. In one instance, Hebrew and Aramaic are mixed in a single sentence: וְיִצְמִיתָ קֶרֶן רַבְרְבִין מְרֻנָּשָׁא ‘And He will exterminate the horn that is eager [to speak] arrogantly’ (line 34). The verb וְיִצְמִיתָ is Hebrew, both lexically as well as morphologically, whereas the rest of the sentence is Aramaic. In an apparent second case: וְתִצְמִיחַ קֶרֶן זְעִירָה וְבִישָׁה ‘Now [the fourth beast] will sprout a small, evil horn’ (l. 26), the spelling with *yod* characterizes the verb וְתִצְמִיחַ as Hebrew *Hifil* rather than Aramaic *Afel*.¹⁶ However the reading וְתִצְמַח appears to be attested in a parallel source (see the apparatus of variants, *ad loc.*), so that the Hebrew form may be the product of a scribal slip. In the majority of cases, the Aramaic employed in the text is BA. However, a number of instances of the use of JPA are also attested. The following is an outright lexical JPA usage: מְתַכְתְּשָׁא ‘struggling’ (l. 29).¹⁷ A number of cases are also found in which a given root is attested in BA, but the form that is found in our text is lacking there, whereas it is attested in JPA: יִתְגַּלָּה ‘He will be revealed’ (l. 32),¹⁸ קוּדְשָׁא ‘holiness’ (l. 33).¹⁹ The same is apparently the case with לְמַבְאָשָׁה ‘to do evil’ (line

Kippur. The *silluq* is yet unpublished, but the Aramaic section has appeared twice: E. Fleischer, מחזורי פיוט מתוך קדושתא ליום כיפור המיוחדת ליוסי בן יוסי, *Kobez al Yad* 7 (17) (1968), pp. 1-79 (79); Sokoloff and Yahalom, שירת בני יון ומקדוניה סלקן כענניה, in the *silluq* of his *qedushta* for 18 benedictions משבית אימות צרים ושושים for the New Moon of Kislev—see E. Fleischer, 'קדושתאות י"ח לראשי חדשים ולחנוכה מאת לעזר החזן', *Kobez al Yad* 9 (19) (1979), pp. 25-127 (86).

¹⁶ The root צמח is not attested in BA. It is, however, found in JPA, including the *Afel* verb—see M. Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period* (Ramat-Gan/Baltimore and London: Bar-Ilan University Press/Johns Hopkins University Press, 2nd ed., 2002) p. 466.

¹⁷ See Sokoloff, *Dictionary*, p. 273.

¹⁸ See Sokoloff, *Dictionary*, pp. 129-130. In BA, the verb גלי 'to reveal' is attested in the *Peal* and *Peil* stems.

¹⁹ See Sokoloff, *Dictionary*, pp. 476-477. In BA, the root is attested exclusively in the adjectival form קדיש.

30), where the *Afel* infinitive takes the JPA form.²⁰ However, the variant reading לאבאשט is attested (see the apparatus of variants, *ad loc.*), in which the corresponding BA form of the infinitive, with prefixed *he*, is employed. Finally, our text employs a collocation, a prepositional phrase, that is lacking in BA but attested in JPA: מן ראש 'from the beginning, of old' (l. 35).²¹ The result, therefore comports well with the general picture referred to above—the Aramaic employed in Classical *piyyut* is predominantly of the BA type, with the possibility of some JPA admixtures.

In light of the data reviewed here, I may venture a number of tentative observations. The *piyyut* that is published below was composed by Yoḥanan ha-Kohen, a Classical *payyetan* in whom we may roughly see the contemporary of Eleazar be-rabbi Qillir (see above). It is therefore evident that an Aramaic component is attested in the corpora a number of prominent Classical *payyetanim*: Yannai, Qillir, and Yoḥanan. To these may be added the Hebrew-Aramaic *qedushta* אגג אמר הצדה, which also falls squarely within the Classical *piyyut* tradition. Finally, an Aramaic component is attested in the work of Le'azar he-ḥazan. Le'azar's dates are even more obscure than those of the three *payyetanim* named above, but his compositions are based on norms that are appropriate to Classical *piyyut*, and he is perhaps to be seen as a relatively late exponent of this period. Taking this information together with the three categories of Aramaic poetry proper that were outlined above, we may surmise that beginning with the period represented by the book of Daniel, poetic expression among Jews proceeded in Hebrew and Aramaic. The Hebrew variety was dominant, owing to the depth and richness of the Hebrew literary tradition, but in terms of basic poetic form, the two are substantially equivalent—late biblical poetry as well as poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls in both Hebrew and Aramaic exhibits to one degree or another the forms of *parallelismus membrorum*. This basic formal parity continues to characterize the relationship between Hebrew and Aramaic poetry in Late Antiquity—in both the biblical *parallelismus membrorum* is replaced by new forms of organization: acrostic, rhyme, strophic patterning, and other structural devices. The Hebrew branch of this development came to be known as *piyyut*, and from its inception was intimately connected to the actual texts of Jewish prayer. With the benefit of hindsight, this association seems entirely natural, as the language of statutory Jewish prayer is Hebrew.²² However, according to the evidence of the Aramaic *qinot* (see above, note 11), tentative efforts were apparently also made to attach Aramaic poetry to statutory prayer. However, these seem to have proved largely unsuccessful—Hebrew *piyyut* was too well entrenched in this locus. In any case, the result of these efforts seems to have been the incorporation of Aramaic into Hebrew *piyyut*. As we have seen, according to the evidence at our disposal, in the Classical period (i.e., the apogee of *piyyut* composition in the East) such incorporation took a number of forms: the inclusion of individual Aramaic elements within a

²⁰ Such a *mem*-prefixed form is listed in Sokoloff, *Dictionary*, p. 83. For the *Afel* infinitive in JPA see S.E. Fassberg, *A Grammar of the Palestinian Targum Fragments from the Cairo Genizah* (Harvard Semitic Studies, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990) p. 177 (§133e).

²¹ See Sokoloff, *Dictionary*, p. 510.

²² Aramaic is not employed in the statutory liturgy. However, it is well attested in a liturgical category that Heinemann defines as 'prayers of Bet Midrash origin', i.e., one that 'came into being in conjunction with the public reading, study and exposition of the *Tôrāh*'—see Heinemann, *Prayer*, pp. 251-275 (the quote is from p. 251). Heinemann writes (pp. 265-266): 'The comparative frequency of Aramaic in these prayers is not really surprising since, in part, they came into being in the wake of the Aramaic translation which was somewhat in the nature of a midrashic exposition; also the sermon itself was mostly delivered in the Aramaic vernacular. Moreover, the preachers presumably preferred to bless the congregation in the language easily intelligible to them'. See also below.

Hebrew matrix, the inclusion of relatively short Aramaic texts within longer Hebrew *piyyut* compositions, or outright composition of *piyyut* in a mixed Hebrew-Aramaic idiom. The latter option, to date attested in the unique case of the *qedushta* אגג אמר הצדה, in fact seems to represent a kind of distant echo of the initial impulse to compose in Aramaic *piyyut* that would be a direct analogue of the Hebrew variety.

The fact that Hebrew *piyyut* came to overwhelmingly predominate within the field of statutory prayer to the detriment of Aramaic composition, in addition to being reflected in the incorporation of the latter within the former, also had the effect of stimulating the development of Aramaic poetry within a specialized niche—that of the Targum (cf. also above, note 22). In other words, the more vigorous Hebrew forced Aramaic to seek refuge in this less central, though by no means marginal, liturgical locus. Again, in hindsight, the association of Aramaic poetry with Aramaic Targum seems as natural as that of the Hebrew *piyyut* with the Hebrew statutory liturgy. In any case, Targum proved a sure refuge for Aramaic poetry, in the context of which it was able to thrive well beyond the temporal and spatial confines of Classical *piyyut*.²³

Finally, I have also mentioned that Hebrew and Aramaic poems are associated with various paraliturgical occasions. With the exception of the Grace after Meals, however, which is governed by the same sort of strict legal regulations that govern the statutory prayers of the synagogue, these are marginal areas of the liturgy in which Hebrew and Aramaic were allowed to subsist together. The poetic Grace after Meals, on the other hand, has evolved as an inseparable part of Hebrew *piyyut*, and is fully subject to its main compositional principle, which specifies the relationship between units of poetry and liturgical fixed-points.

3. The *Qedushta* איזון שמע מדובר for Shabbat *Shim'u* by Yoḥanan ha-Kohen

The Aramaic fragment under examination here is part of a liturgical composition called a *qedushta*.²⁴ The *qedushta* is composed of component *piyyutim*, the last of which is called the *silluq*. Within the liturgical framework, the *silluq* is immediately followed by the recitation of the first verse of the *qedushta* (i.e., the liturgical *trisagion*): 'קדוש קדוש קדוש... Holy, holy, holy...' (Isa. 3:3).²⁵ Our fragment appears in the *silluq*. The *qedushta* in question, איזון שמע מדובר, was composed by the Classical *payyetan* Yoḥanan ha-Kohen, who seems to have lived in Palestine or its environs around the time of the change in hegemony over the region between the Byzantine and the Arab-Muslim empires.²⁶ The *qedushta* was composed for recitation on Shabbat *Shim'u*,

²³ For examples of post-Classical Targum poetry in the East, see note 10. Aramaic poems also accompany the reading of Scripture on the Seventh Day of Passover and Shavuot in the Ashkenazic rite: see the materials published in Y. Frenkel, מחזור פסח (Jerusalem: Koren, 1993) pp. 608-658; idem, מחזור שבועות (Jerusalem: Koren, 2000) pp. 385-593. The most famous of these is the poem אקדמות מילין by Meir bar Yish'aq, recited after Exod. 19:1, the first verse of the Pentateuchal lection for Shavuot (idem, שבועות, pp. 385-395).

²⁴ The structure of the Classical *qedushta* for Sabbaths is described extensively in Fleischer, שירת-הקודש, pp. 138-164. No full English-language treatment exists, but one may profitably consult L. Lieber, *Yannai on Genesis – An Invitation to Piyyut* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 2010) pp. 36-64.

²⁵ In some *qedushtaot* the *silluq* may be followed by another series of *piyyutim*, which are interspersed between the verses of the *qedushta*. These are not attested consistently, however.

²⁶ As mentioned above, Yoḥanan and Qillir are roughly contemporaries. The *piyyutim* of Yoḥanan ha-Kohen have been edited by N. Weissenstern, פיוטי יוחנן הכהן בירבי יהושע (Hebrew University PhD thesis, 1983). Our *qedushta* is found on pp. 66-78. For the time and place of the *payyetan*, see pp. שכ-שיג, together with J. Yahalom, פיוט ומציאות (Tel Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuchad, 1999) pp. 84-87.

one of the three Sabbaths of Rebuke that precede the fast of the Ninth of Av, the day on which the destruction of the Temple is commemorated.²⁷ The seven Sabbaths that follow the fast day are in turn known as the Sabbaths of Consolation. Liturgically, these special Sabbaths are all characterized by the reading of special Prophetic lections that focus on the themes of rebuke and consolation, respectively. The custom of reading special Prophetic lections on these Sabbaths is originally Palestinian, but it was eventually adopted into the Babylonian liturgical rite as well, whence it has spread to all Jewish rites.²⁸ The liturgical importance of the Sabbaths of Rebuke during the Classical period may be gauged by the fact that they were adorned by at least two cycles of *qedushtot*, composed by the *payyetanim* Yannai and Yehudah.²⁹

The Prophetic lection for Shabbat *Shim'u*, from which it derives its name, begins with שמעו דבר 'Hear the word of the Lord, House of Israel' (Jer. 2:4). Hence, the theme of hearing, and with it the root שמע as well as other roots belonging to this semantic field, is prominent in the *piyyutim* for this occasion, mostly in the sense of Israel's not hearkening to God's commandments and His rebukes. In accordance with an ancient liturgical custom, the *qedushta* for Shabbat *Shim'u* treats not only the theme of rebuke, but also, towards its end, the opposite theme of consolation, i.e., the restoration of Israel their land and the destruction of their enemies at the end of days. It is the latter theme that is treated in the *silluq* ללשה תשמיע ניהומים, within which our fragment is found.³⁰ The *silluq* was published previously in ed. Weissenstern (see note 26). However, the text given there is truncated, and more than half of the *silluq*, including the Aramaic portion, is missing.³¹ The present edition is based on four manuscript sources, including the single source employed by Weissenstern. The three additional sources employed here contain a fuller form of the *silluq*, though it is possible that the original, complete text has yet to be established (see below, note 38). The first 22 lines of the *silluq* are subject to a straight alphabetic acrostic, which does not affect the overall structuring of the *piyyut* into rhyme-units: the rhyme unit -שה, with which the *silluq* opens and within which the acrostic appears, continues past the end of the acrostic, terminating only at line 39. In other words, the acrostic structure is not coterminous with the rhyme structure.

²⁷ For an English-language overview of the Sabbaths of Rebuke, with special regard for Shabbat *Shim'u* as reflected in *piyyut*, see W. Van Bakkum and N. Katsumata, 'Shabbat Shim'u (Jer. 2,4): A Kaleidoscopic View of a Liturgical-Poetic Theme', *Frankfurter Judaistische Beiträge*, 37 (2011/12), 75-107.

²⁸ See Fleischer, שירת-הקודש, p. 37.

²⁹ Yannai: Z.M. Rabinovitz, מחזור פיוטי רבי ינאי לתורה ולמועדים – כך ב, (Jerusalem: Bialik, 1987) pp. 300-325; Yehuda: W.J. Van Bakkum, *The Qedushta'ot of Yehudah according to Genizah Manuscripts* (Proefschrift, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen, 1988) pp. 535-561. For additional material from the *silluq* of Yehuda's *qedushta*, see the article cited in the following note. In the *oeuvre* of Yohanan only the *qedushta* for Shabbat *Shim'u* is presently attested. The Qillir corpus contains parts of a monumental *qedushta* for Shabbat *Eicha*, the third of the Sabbaths of Rebuke—see E. Fleischer, 'לוח מועדי השנה בפיוט לר' אלעזר בירבי קיליר', in idem, תפילות הקבע, pp. 1.357-406; idem, 'לפתרון שאלת זמנו ומקום פעילותו של ר', תפילות הקבע, pp. 1.407-415; idem, 'תשלום לקרובת הקילירי לשבת איכה', *Tarbiz* 54 (1985), pp. 383-427.

³⁰ The same is true of the *silluq* תשובה תשמיע חידה for Shabbat *Shim'u* by Yehuda—see M. Rand, 'האם "מחזור ארץ ישראל: קודקס הגניזה" אכן שימש בארץ ישראל? קטעים חדשים של הקודקס', *Tarbiz* 82 (2014), pp. 529-547 (542-545). For relatively rare midrashic material shared by the two *silluqim*, see the commentary to lines 38-42 in the edition below.

³¹ The text given ed. Weissenstern comprises lines 1-22 of the present edition—i.e., the lines containing the alphabetic acrostic—followed by a four-line segment that serves as a thematic transition to the recitation of the *qedushta*. This segment is most likely not original, its purpose being to bridge the thematic discontinuity between the *piyyut* and the *qedushta*, created as a result of the truncation of the former. It is printed in small font in the Hebrew critical edition below.

One of the manuscript sources for our text, ms. ENA 3443/2 (ב), is of particular codicological interest with regard to its copyist. This single leaf is presently catalogued adjacent to another leaf belonging to the same copy: ENA 3443/1. These two leaves, which most likely originally belong to a single bi-folio, are not consecutive. They contain the text of a *qedushta* for Shabbat *Shim'u* that comprises *piyyutim* by various *payyetanim*. Our *silluq* is copied on the verso of the second leaf, up to line 46, which is followed by three additional lines unattested elsewhere (see below), at which point the text breaks off. The bi-folio was produced by a prolific copyist employing a highly characteristic, and therefore easily-recognizable, hand. Dozens of leaves produced by this copyist have survived in the Genizah, bearing witness to an attempt to produce a poetic-liturgical program encompassing what may well have been the entire liturgical year.³² The copyist employs a wide range of *piyyutim* composed by various *payyetanim* from the Classical period and beyond. Among the *piyyut* compositions preserved in the materials produced by the copyist in question, one finds compositions in which three names, signed in the acrostic, appear to cluster: דוסא, עלי (sometimes found together in a single acrostic: דוסא עלי) and יהושע (variants: יהושע חבר, יהושע (ה)חזן, יהושע אלאדקי). In one case, a relationship is indicated between the named individuals: דושא החזן בן יהושע. The frequency and clustering of these names led Fleischer to surmise that they represent members of a single group or family, one of whom is also our copyist.³³ Furthermore, on the basis of the identification of יהושע אלאדקי (i.e., אל לאדקי, from Latakia in Syria) with יהושע אלחזאן בן אלאדקי, who is known to have had a poetic exchange with a certain אברהם בן עלון, resident in Syria around the year 1015, Fleischer determined that the poets represented by the names are to be placed in Syria-Palestine at around the end of the 10th or the beginning of the 11th centuries.³⁴ He also mentioned in passing that a family whose members bear the names in question is attested in the documentary Genizah.³⁵

Our *silluq*, in addition to being copied in four sources, is mentioned in a fifth: ms. Frankfurt 152 (Schocken Institute photostat).³⁶ This manuscript, which was likely produced by a synagogue precentor for his own use, contains *piyyutim* that constitute part of a liturgical program for Shabbat *Shim'u*. Among these, we find our *silluq*, which (as opposed to the other *piyyutim*) is not copied in full, but rather simply mentioned by name, a complete copy apparently being easily available to the copyist: *Silluq*: 'סלוק. תשמיע ניהומים לליש[ה]. והו מצחח פי נסכה עלי בן יהושע החבר. תשמיע ניהומים ללישה. It[s text] is properly established in the version of Eli ben Yehoshua he-

³² I am currently in the early stages of a research project whose aim is to gather, reconstruct and analyze those materials produced by the copyist in question that have been preserved in the Genizah. It is already clear on the basis of my work that these materials represent more than a single codex.

³³ See E. Fleischer, *היוצרות בהתהוותם והתפתחותם* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1984) pp. 454-456. In his discussion, Fleischer concentrates specifically on the name Dosa, since this is the name that is numerically predominant in the material, but given what he writes about the impossibility of determining the exact nature of the relationship between the individuals behind the names, this point is immaterial for his argument. Fleischer also discusses the matter in a later publication: idem, 'חידותה (י)', *Italia* 13-15 (2001), pp. 9-30 (13-14). Here, he suggests that the copyist may have been Dosa's secretary.

³⁴ Fleischer, *היוצרות*, p. 456. Fragments of the poems exchanged between the two are published in J. Schirmann, *שירים חדשים מן הגניזה* (Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1965) p. 56. Biographical data on אברהם בן עלון are given there on p. 54. The identification is not specifically repeated in Fleischer, 'חידותה (י)', but there is no reason to think that he had in the meantime rejected it.

³⁵ Fleischer, *היוצרות*, p. 456 note 13; idem, 'חידותה (י)', pp. 13-14 notes 22-23.

³⁶ For the Frankfurt Genizah fragments, see B. Richler, *Guide to Hebrew Manuscript Collections* (Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 2014) p. 72.

Ḥaver'. The names mentioned in this source tally with the names that are attested in the leaves under consideration here, together with the title *ḥaver* of Yehoshua.³⁷ Furthermore, the writer of the note in ms. Frankfurt indicates that Eli ben Yehoshua he-Ḥaver had produced a manuscript containing *piyyutim*, of unknown extent, our *silluq* among them. This tallies with the suggestion already made by Fleischer that Dosa, Eli and/or Yehoshua are connected to the production of the manuscript material that contains the *piyyutim* bearing their names.

One may perhaps point to a further piece of evidence strengthening the identification of Eli ben Yehoshua he-Ḥaver with the copyist of source ב (together with the other material produced by him). Sources א and ג provide the full text of the *silluq* as given in the present edition: lines 1-65. Source ב is truncated before the end of the *silluq*: it contains lines 1-46. Line 46 is the last line of the rhyme-unit *שֶׁה*. In א and ג it is followed by line 47, which opens a new rhyme-unit: *יֵרֶה*. In ב, on the other hand, line 46 is followed by three lines (unnumbered in the present edition) that constituting an additional rhyme-unit, *עוֹת*. This rhyme-unit is unattested in א and ג. It may be therefore that the comment made in ms. Frankfurt to the effect that the text of the *silluq* is 'properly established in the version of Eli ben Yehoshua he-Ḥaver' refers to the presence of the rhyme-unit *עוֹת* in the pristine manuscript now represented by source ב.³⁸

The evidence provided by ms. Frankfurt seems to indicate that the hand that copied source ב along with all the other leaves bearing the same handwriting that are scattered in the Genizah is that of Eli ben Yehoshua he-Ḥaver. This is presumably the same Eli whose name appears in the acrostic signatures of numerous *piyyutim* that are copied in these materials. The father of this Eli was Yehoshua he-Ḥaver, whose name is also attested in the acrostic signatures of poems copied therein. Before becoming a *ḥaver*, this Yehoshua, (whose family was) originally from Latakia, had been a *ḥazzan*. As we have seen, the acrostics in question also explicitly indicate the existence of a familial relationship between two of the three names: *דוֹסָא הַחֲזָן בֶּן יְהוֹשֻׁעַ*.³⁹ According to this signature, Dosa was also a *ḥazzan*, as his father had been. We have also seen that in some cases, Dosa appears together with Eli in the same acrostic: *דוֹסָא עָלֵי*.⁴⁰ Taken together, these data seem to indicate that the two were brothers.

The above surmises can now be confirmed with a reasonable degree of certainty from the documentary Genizah. The most important relevant document is preserved in ms. T-S 13J 23.5, a letter written around the middle of the 11th century to Dosa ben Yehoshua he-Ḥaver al-Ladhiqi in Fustat by his mother in Raqqa in Syria.⁴¹ From another letter, preserved in ms. T-S 24.59, and

³⁷ The title indicates that Yehoshua was an official member (*ḥaver*) of the Palestinian Yeshiva. Previous to having acquired this title, he had been known as a precentor (*ḥazzan*).

³⁸ If this argument is accepted, we have before us a medieval witness to the fact that the rhyme-unit *עוֹת*, currently represented by these three lines in source ב, is original to the *silluq*, making it quite likely that the complete text of this *piyyut* has yet to be restored.

³⁹ Thus in the *gerova* *וְאִשְׁמַחָה בְּהִדְרַת זָקִינִים*, copied in ms. Mosseri V.80. The text is published in Sh. Abramason, 'קרובות לחתן', *Tarbiz* 15 (1943), pp. 50-62 (57-59).

⁴⁰ Thus, for example, in the *pizmon* *לְקַהֲלָתָם* from the *qedushta* for Parashat *בְּהַעֲלֹתָךְ* (Num. 8.1), copied in ms. Kaufmann 71 (=cat. Widder 29).

⁴¹ See M. Gil, *במלכות ישמעאל בתקופת הגאונים* (Publications of the Diaspora Research Institute, 117; Tel-Aviv/Jerusalem: Tel Aviv University/Bialik/Ministry of Defense, 1997) vol. 1, pp. 1.512-513. Gil writes there that 'the al-Ladhiqi family is settled in Raqqa... The males in the family all emigrated to Egypt' (translations from this source mine). The text of the letter is edited in vol. 2, pp. 236-240.

also apparently written in the middle of the 11th century, we read of Eli Ben Yehoshua, a permanent *hazzan* and communal official in Raqqa (l. 26: פקבעוה והו חזאן פי אלרקה מקדם (אלבלד).⁴² Eli's position as *hazzan* obviously tallies with his activities as a copyist of liturgical material.

In view of the evidence adduced here, it now seems that the materials in question, including ms. ENA 3443/2, were copied around the middle of the 11th century by one Eli ben Yehoshua. This Eli was settled in Raqqa, whereas his brother Dosa was resident in Fustat. All three individuals belonged to the al-Ladhiqi family, and all were called *hazzan*. The father Yehoshua also held the title of *haver* from the Palestinian Yeshiva.

4. Edition of the *Silluq* תשמיע ניחומים ללישה

Editorial Sigla: ⌘ = doubtful reading; [א] = lacuna or editor's emendation; <<א>> = scribal omission

[note to the typesetter: In the case of the hollow letters, only the letter itself ought to be hollow. The associated vocalization sign(s) ought to be normal.]

ובכן ולך תעלה קדושה כי אתה אלוהנו

תשמיע ניחומים ללישה
שמוע ברית חדש[ה]
רפוי מכה האנושה
קרואה הר פעמים שלוש[ה] 5
ציון כשדה חרושה
פזורה ועל ההרים נ[ט]ושה
עוז ותפארת לה להלבישה
סולו סולו לעמה לפרושה
נפוציה להביא ברגישה
מאדמתה לבל תהי נתושה 10
לשאננה במרגוע נפישוה
כי טריתה נחבשה
מין זרועך הקדושה
טירתך תכונן בקדושה
חפציבה תיקרא דרושה 15
זבול המכונן לישיבה הקדושה
והוציא את האבן הראשה
הר שעיר ואדום שים ירישה
דבר לאשור ימהר ויחישוה
גוי חנף במטה זעמך לדושה 20
בכן ישמע חזות קשה
אף הוא ג[י]ע בחלישה
כי עצה העמיק והקשה

⁴² Gil, *מלכות ישמעאל*, vol. 1, p. 513. Gil surmises that the Eli mentioned here was 'perhaps the brother of the abovementioned Dosa' (i.e., the Dosa mentioned in ms. T-S 13J 23.5). In light of the evidence adduced here, this conclusion seems nearly certain. The letter in which Eli is mentioned, mc. T-S 24.59, is published in idem, *ארץ-ישראל בתקופה המוסלמית הראשונה* (1099-634) (Publications of the Diaspora Research Institute, 57; Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University/Bialik/Ministry of Defense, 1983) vol. 2, pp. 356-359. For other references to Dosa, see the index, vol. 3, p. 666 (s.v. אללאד'קי, אללאד'קי).

סיום נוסח ב (כ"י ד, אחרי טור 22):

וְנִעְרֵץ וְנִקְדִּישָׁה
כְּאֵילֵי קֹדֶשׁ לְשִׁלְשָׁה
הַמְשֻׁלָּשִׁים קְדוּשָׁה
לְאֵל הַנִּעְרָץ בְּקְדוּשָׁה

כזה מזה מקב<לים>

Translation

And so: A qedusha will ascend to you for You are our God

¹ You'll proclaim consolation to Laish, / A proclamation of a new covenant, / A healing of the sore wound; / The one thrice called 'mountain', / ⁵ Zion, ploughed like a field, / Scattered and abandoned on the mountains – / Clothing her in strength and splendor, / Announcing 'Cast up, Cast up [a highway]!' to her people, / Bringing her scattered in a throng, / ¹⁰ That she not be uprooted from her land, / To give her ease in quiet rest. / For her raw [wound] has been bound – / Your holy right hand / will establish Your Tower in holiness. / ¹⁵ She will be called I-delight-in-her, Sought One, / the Lofty Habitation, destined for [God's] holy abode, / 'And He will produce the capstone'. / Make Mt. Seir and Edom a possession, / May [Your] word hasten quickly to Asshur, / ²⁰ threshing the godless nation with the rod of Your anger. / And so He will announce a harsh vision, / indeed will arrive to overwhelm. / For His counsel is profound and firm – / seeking elevation for Himself, / ²⁵ so as to inherit eternal kingship. / Now [the fourth beast] will sprout a small, evil horn, / stamping and treading down the whole earth. / It has eyes like the eyes of man, / [And] strives with the saints. / ³⁰ It will overpower them with evil-doing, / but will be cast in a flaming fire. / Then the Watchful and Holy One will be revealed, / all the holy people with Him. / And He'll exterminate the horn that is eager [to speak] arrogantly, / ³⁵ Made plain to David of old, / called by three names, / inscribed with three ciphers. / Then You'll bring forth three sounds, / with the roaring of three horns –

⁴⁰ One waking the dead, / One gathering the scattered, / One shaking heaven and earth – / To bring the One Shepherd, / proclaim salvation to the One Nation, / ⁴⁵ reveal Your unique Name / to those who say 'The Lord is One'.

Ms. **x** only:

And when You proclaim tidings / I'll raise the cup of salvation / that You look to me / [...]

And You'll don ten garments / to wreak vengeance on Lady Edom, / ⁴⁹⁻⁵⁰ discomfit her on the great and terrible day of furious anger. / And You'll make known to the Created People / that crown, glory and splendor are Yours, / And they'll sing You a new song. / Yours are might and glory, / ⁵⁵ chaplet and crown befit You – / To bequeath the tribes of the Black Woman / a kingdom preserved forever. / And a voice will cry out to the City, / 'Arise, shout, Barren One!' / ⁶⁰ Your groaning has now passed, / And the light has flourished. / Behold, I Have laid your foundation in purity, / in sapphire and precious stone. / And we'll sanctify You, Awesome [God] / ⁶⁵ Like the [angels] calling out to one another.

As it is written: And one called to the other, 'Holy, holy, holy! The Lord of Hosts! His glory fills all the earth!'

Commentary

1 תשמיע ניוחמים ללישה *You'll proclaim consolation to Laish*: Cf. הקשיבי לישה (Isa. 10.30). The place name is a metonym of Zion/Israel. **2 רפוי מכה** *new covenant*: Jer. 31.30. **3 ומכתי אנושה מאנה הרפא** *A healing of the sore wound*: The collocation is based on האנושה (Jer. 15.18). **4 קרואה ... שלשה** *The one thrice called 'mountain'*: The poet is apparently hinting at a midrash that enumerates three cases in Scripture of the use of the word הר as a reference to Jerusalem, but I have been unable to locate such a one in the sources. For a midrash that enumerates more than three instances, see, הכל קראו אותו הר, [דב' כ, כה], הכל קראו אותו הר, אברהם קראו הר שנאמר אשר יאמר היום בהר ה' יראה [בר' כב, יד], משה קראו הר שנאמר ההר הטוב הזה [דב' כ, כה], דוד קראו הר שנאמר מי יעלה בהר ה' [תה' כד, ג], ישעיה קראו הר שנאמר והיה באחרית הימים נכון יהיה הר בית ה' [יש' ב, ב], גוים קראו אותו הר שנאמר והלכו עמים רבים ואמרו לכו ונעלה אל הר ה' [שם, ג] (Sifre Deut. 28 [pp. 44-45]). **5 ציון כשדה חרושה** *Zion, ploughed like a field*: Based on ציון ועל (Jer. 50.17). **6 פזורה** *Scattered*: Cf. שה פזורה ישראל (Jer. 26.18; Mic. 3.12). **7 ראיית את ישראל נפצים אל ההרים כצאן אשר אין** *and abandoned on the mountains*: Cf. והנה נטשים על פני כל הארץ (1 Kgs 22.17 [and the parallel in 2 Chron. 18.16]); להם רעה (1 Sam. 30.16). **8 נטשוה** *abandoned*: Ms. ד reads רטשוה. The root רטש is employed in the Targums as a translation of biblical נטש, and it is attested in this sense also in Rabbinic Hebrew – see Moreshet, *Lexicon*, p. 345 (s.v. רטש). **9 להבישה עוז ... להלבישה** *Clothing her in strength and splendor*: Based on לבשי בגדי תפארתך (Isa. 52.1). **10 עוז ותפארת** *strength and splendor*: Ps. 96.6. For the lexical pair cf. also מטה עז מקל תפארה (Jer. 48.17) and תפארת עזמו (Ps. 89.18). **11 סולו סולו** *Cast up, Cast up [a highway]*: Isa. 57.14. **12 לפרושה** *Announcing*: The word indicates clear speech—cf. Lev. 24.12. **13 נפוציה** *her scattered*: See the verse cited in the comment to line 6. **14 ברגיש** *in a throng*: Similar to ברגש; cf. Ps. 55.15. **15 מרגוע נפיש** *in quiet rest*: The lexical pair is based on מרגוע (Jer. 6.16). **16 טריתה** *her raw [wound]*: Based on ומכה טריה (Isa. 1.6). **17 ימין זרועך** *Your holy right hand*: The collocation is based on ימינו וזרוע קדשו (Ps. 98.1). **18 טירתך** *Your Tower*: An epithet for the Temple. **19 חפציבה תיקרא דרושה** *She will be called I-delight-in-her, Sought One*: Based on כי לך יקרא חפצי-בה (Isa. 62.4) and ולך יקרא דרושה (Isa. 64.12). **20 זבול** *Lofty Habitation*: An epithet for the Temple, based on 1 Kgs 8.13 (=2 Chron. 6.2). **21 המכון לישיבה** *destined for [God's] holy abode*: Based on the end of the same verse—מכון לשבתך (Isa. 5.19). **22 הר ... ירישה** *Make Mt. Seir and Edom a possession*: Based on והיה אדום ירשה והיה ירשה שעיר איביו (Num. 24.18). The addition of the word הר, which supplies the acrostic letter, is apparently influenced also by the first part of the verse cited in the preceding line—מי אתה הר הגדול לפני זרבבל למישור (Zech. 4.7). **23 ויחיש** *May [Your] word hasten quickly to Asshur*: May it be Your will that the word of retribution that has been spoken against Asshur (a metonym for all of Israel's enemies) come quickly. The reference is to the Isaianic prophesy that is referred to in the first line of the *silluq*—Isa. 10.24 foll. **24 ימהר ויחיש** *hasten quickly*: The lexical pair is based on ימהר ויחיש (Isa. 5.19). **25 באף תדוש גוים** *threshing the godless nation with the rod of Your anger*: Cf. (Hab. 3.12). **26 גו חנף** *godless nation*: For the collocation see Isa. 10:6; the enemies of Israel are meant. **27 במטה זעמך** *with the rod of Your anger*: The collocation is based on במטה זעמי (Isa. 10:5). **28 בן ... קשה** *And so He will announce a harsh vision*: Ms. ד reads differently: במלכות פרא לדושה. This reading contains a reference to Arab-Muslim rule (פרא, based on Gen. 16.12). However, it does not seem to be original; the reading of the base text is attested in mss. **29 חזות קשה** *harsh vision*: Isa. 21.2. **30 בחלישה** *to overwhelm*: I.e., with retribution and vengeance exacted upon His enemies. The usage is based on ויחלש יהושע את עמלק (Exod. 17.13).

23 המעמיקים מיי לסתיר עצה *His counsel is profound*: The collocation is based on עיני גבהות אדם שפל ... ונשגב יי (Isa. 29.15). 24 גבהות לעצמו לדרשה *seeking elevation for Himself*: Cf. יי ונשגב יי (Isa. 2.11) and also verse 17. 25 מלכותך מלכות כל עלמים *eternal kingship*: Cf. יי ונשגב יי (Isa. 2.11) and also verse 17. 26 בישה ... ותצמיח *Now [the fourth beast] will sprout a small, evil horn*: Based on כל ... 27 ואלו קרן אחרי זעירא סלקת ... ואלו עינין כעיני אנשא בקרנא דא (Dan. 7.8 [and cf. also 7.20]). 28 עינין כעיני אנשא *eyes like the eyes of man*: See the comment to line 26. 29-30 להון ... עם *strives with the saints. It will overpower them*: Based on עינין כעיני אנשא בקרנא דא (Dan. 7.21). 29 מתכתשא *strives*: The verb is attested in JPA—see Sokoloff, *Dictionary*, p. 273. 30 למבאשא *evil-doing*: This is the JPA form of the infinitive; in ms. ב the corresponding BA form is attested: לאבאשא. 31 ותתיהב ליקידת אשה *but will be cast in a flaming fire*: Based on ויהיבת ליקידת אשה (Dan. 7.11). 32 עירה וקדישא *the Watchful and Holy One*: Based on עיר וקדיש (Dan. 4.10, 20). In Daniel, the reference is to some sort of angelic being, whereas a plain-sense reading of the present context seems to indicate that the reference here is to God Himself. However, it is possible that the *payyetan* had in mind an angel sent to redeem Israel. 34 רברבין מרגשא *eager [to speak] arrogantly*: Based on ופם ממלל (Dan. 7.8, 20). In BA הרגש means ‘to come thronging’. 35 מפרשה לדוד ... מפרשה *Made plain to David of old*: Referring to the (typological) ‘wicked kingdom’ that oppresses Israel, foreseen by David—see דוד רואה אותם ארבעתם היאך הם באות בכח ומשתעבדות בישראל, התחיל תמיה עליהם ואומר— אשר הראיתני צרות רבות ורעות [תה’ עא, כ], רבות שתיים מלכות מדי ומלכות אדום, תשוב תחייני ומתהומות הארץ תשוב תעליני [שם] אמר תחייני מן הראשונה משיעבודה של מלכות בבל, תשוב תחייני מן השנייה משיעבודה של מדי, תעליני מן השלישית משיעבודה של יון, מתהומות הארץ תשוב תעליני זו אדום הרשע (Pesiqta Rabbati 33 [fol. 152b]). 36 הנקובה *of old*: The phrase is attested in JPA—see Sokoloff, *Dictionary*, p. 510. 37 מפרשא *Made plain*: For this usage see Ezra 4.18. 38-42 באחד ... בכן *Then You’ll bring forth three sounds ... One shaking heaven and earth*: The *payyetan* enumerates the three *shofarot* that will be sounded in the future. Cf. יתקע בשופר גדול [יש’ כז, יג] דשלשה שופרות הן לעתיד לבא. אחד להחיות מתים ... ואחד. אחד (Mahzor Vitry, par. שלג [p. 371]; and with minor variations in Arugat ha-Bosem 3, pp. 472-473). See also Setel, *Three Shofar Blasts*. This midrash is attested also in the *silluq* of the *qedushta* חידה ללמודי חידה for Shabbat Shim’u by Yehuda: בְּהַשְׁמִיעַךְ שְׁלוֹשׁ תְּקִיעוֹת / אַחַת לְרוֹמֵם הַטְּבִיעוֹת / וְאַחַת לְהַחְיֵי נַשְׁמוֹת הַבְּלוּעוֹת / וְאַחַת לְנַעֵר וְהַקְמִתִּי (lines 27-30; Rand, *MEY*, p. 544). See also Elizur and Rand, *Qillir RH*, pp. 152-154. 43 רועה אחד *One Shepherd*: And epithet for the Messiah son of David, based on והקמתי (Ezek. 34.23, and see also 37.24). 44 לגוי אחד *to the One Nation*: An epithet for Israel, based on ומי כעמך כישראל גוי אחד בארץ (2 Sam. 7.23 [=1 Chron. 17.21]) and ועשיתי אתם לגוי אחד בארץ (Ezek. 37.22). 46 לאומרי יי אחד *to those who say ‘The Lord is One’*: To Israel, who say ‘Hear, O Israel...’ (Deut. 6.4). [Text from ms. ב: 47-48 תולבש ... *I’ll raise the cup of salvation*: Based on כוס ישועות אשא (Ps. 116.13).] 49 הגבירה *And You’ll don ten garments to wreak vengeance on Lady Edom*: A reference to God’s ten garments: בעשרה מקומות נקראו ישר’ כלה ... וכנגדן לבש הקב”ה עשרה לבושין ... הלבוש התשיעי (PDRK 22.5 [pp. 329-330]). In the present case, however, God will wear all ten garments at the time of His vengeance on Edom. 49 להממה *discomfit her*: In the parallel BH form the *mem* is doubled by means of a *dagesh*: להמם (Deut. 2:15; Est. 9.24). 49-50 הגדול והנורא *on the great and*

זעם ועברה 49. *terrible day of furious anger*: Based on Joel 3.4; Mal. 3.23). **לעם ניבא** 51. *to the Created People*: *furious anger*: For the lexical pair cf. *עברה זעם* (Ps. 78.49). **לך ... גבורה** 54. *Yours are might and glory*: Ps. 89.14. An epithet for Israel, based on Ps. 102.19. **שחורה** 56. *the Black Woman*: An epithet for Israel, based on Song 1.5). **קול רני** 59. *And a voice will cry out to the City*: Based on Mic. 6.9). **קומי רני עקרה** 62-63. *Arise, shout, Barren One!*: Based on Lam. 2.19) and *רני עקרה* (Isa. 54.1). **הנה ... יקרה**. *Behold, I Have laid your foundation in purity, in sapphire and precious stone*: Based on Isa. 54.11-12). *הנה אנכי מרביץ בפוך אבניך ויסדתיך בספירים ... וכל גבולך לאבני חפץ*

Sources

Base text: ENA 351/10-11 (lines 1-65; א); ENA 3443/2 (lines 1-46 + the three unnumbered lines after line 46; ב); T-S NS 208.18 (lines 2 [ב]רית-65; ג); Ox. Heb. f. 36, fol. 6-7 (=part of cat. Neubauer 2738/1; lines 1-22 + end version ד; ב)

The text is also mentioned in ms. Frankfurt 152 (Schocken Institute photostat): **תשמיע**. **סלוק**. **ניחומים לליש[ה]**. והו מצחח פי נסכה עלי בן יהושע החבר

Previous edition (solely on the basis of ms. ד): Weissenstern, *Yohanan*, pp. 78 (text), 238-239 (commentary)

Variant Readings

כותרת: סלוק שמעו ב סלוקה דשמעו ד 2 שמוע[ע] שימוע ב 4 שלושה[ע] שלשה ב 6 נטושה[ע] ההגהה על פי ונטושה ב רטושה ד נפושה ג 7 עוז[ע] עז ב / ותפארת[ע] ותפארה ג ד / לה[ע] חסר ב 8 לעמה[ע] אורח לעמה ב / לפרושה[ע] לפרשה ד להחיש[ע] ב 9 נפוציה[ע] נפציה ד נפוצה ב 10 לבל[ע] בל ב / נתושה[ע] נטושה ד 11 במרגוע[ע] במרגיע ג 12 טריתה[ע] טרייתה ב ג ד 13 הקדושה[ע] ח[ש]ו[ע] לקדשה ד 14 בקדושה[ע] ולחדשה ד 15 תיקרא[ע] תקרא ב ג ד 16 הקדושה[ע] קדושה ג הקד'שה ד 17 את[ע] חסר ג 18 ירשה[ע] ירשה ב 19 ימהר[ע] וימהר ג 20 זעמך לדושה[ע] עוזך לחרושה ד 21 במקומו נוסח אחר במלכות פרא לדושה ד / ישמע[ע] ישמיע ב 22 הוא[ע] חסר ד / יגיע[ע] ההגהה על פי ב ד יגוע א / בחלישה[ע] בלחיש[ע] ב 24 לעצמו[ע] לעמו ב 25 לירשה[ע] לבשה ב 26 ותצמיח[ע] ותצמ'ת כנראה מתוקן מן ותצמח ג / זעירה[ע] זעי[ע]רא ב / ובישה[ע] ויבישה ב 27 רפסה[ע] רפסא ב 28 לה[ע] ולה ב / עינין[ע] עיינין ג / כעיני[ע] כעיני ב ג / אנשא[ע] אינשה ג 29 מתכנשא[ע] מתכנשא ב 30 למבאשה[ע] לאבאשא ב 31 ותתיהב[ע] ותת[ע]היב ב / אשה[ע] אשא ב 32 בכך יתגלה עירה[ע] ותגלי עיר ב / וקדישא[ע] וק[ע]דישה ג 33 עמיה[ע] ההגהה על פי ב עימיה ג לעלמה א / קודשא[ע] קודשה ג קדושא ב 34 ההשלמה על פי ב חסר א 35 לדוד[ע] לדוד ב / ראש[ע] ראש ב / מפרשא[ע] מפרשה ג 36 שימות שלושה[ע] ש[ע]מ[ע]ו[ע] שלושה ב 37 הטור חסר ב 38 בכך תשמיע[ע] בהן[ע] תשמיע ב / שלושה[ע] שלושה ב 39 בשאג[ע] כמאז ב / שלושה[ע] שלושה ב 40 מתים[ע] מיתים ג 46 אחד[ע] אלהינו יי אחד ב 52 נזר וגבורה[ע] נצח ג 58 יקרא[ע] תקרא ג 60 אנחתך כבר[ע] כבר[ע] ג 61 אורה[ע] שמחה ואורה ג 63 ובאבן[ע] ואבן ג

Bibliographical Abbreviations

Arugat ha-Bosem 3 – E.E. Urbach (ed.), *Sefer Arugat Habosem – III* (Jerusalem: Mekize Nirdamim, 1964)

Elizur and Rand, *Qillir RH* – Sh. Elizur and M. Rand, **רבי אלעזר בירבי קליר: פיוטים לראש השנה** (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies/The David and Amalia Rosen Foundation, 2014)

Mahzor Vitry – S. Hurvitz (ed.), *Machsor Vitry* (Nuremberg: J. Bulka, 2nd ed., 1923)

Moreshet, *Lexicon* – M. Moreshet, **לפועל שנתחדש בלשון התנאים** (Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1980)

PDRK – B. Mandelbaum (ed.), *Pesikta de Rav Kahana* (New York: JTSA, 1987)

Pesiqta Rabbati – M. Friedman (Ish-Shalom) (ed.), *Pesikta Rabbati* (Vienna: 1880) [note to editor: no publisher]

Rand, *MEY* – see note 30 in the article

סגולה: עיונים, in idem, 'שלושת התקיעות שבאחרית הימים', Setel, *Three Shofar Blasts* – Y.Y. Setel, 'שלושת התקיעות שבאחרית הימים', in idem, עיונים: סגולה, א (Jerusalem: 2012) [note to editor: no publisher]
Sifre Deut. – L. Finkelstein (ed.), *Sifre on Deuteronomy* (New York: JTSA, 2001)
Sokoloff, *Dictionary* – see note 16 in the article
Weissenstern, *Yohanan* – see note 26 in the article